48

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 1066 OF 2003

Petitioner : Basant Kumar Yadu, S/o late Shri Hemnath Yadu, aged about 52 years, R/o Nava Tikrapara, Khairagarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon (CG)

Versus

Respondents :
1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Public Works, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Asstt. Secretary, Public Works Department, Mantralaya, DKS Bhawan,Raipur (CG)
3. Superintendent Engineer, P.W.D, Durg Circle, Distt. Durg (CG)
4. Executive Engineer, P.W.D., Khairagarh Division, Khairagarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon (CG)
5. Sub Divisional Officer, P.W.D., (B&R), Khairagarh Sub Division, Khairagarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon (CG)

Shri R.S. Baghel, learned counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Sumesh Bajaj, learned Dy. Govt. Advocate for State/respondents.

ORAL ORDER

(2nd February, 2006)

The petitioner, who was working as Asstt. Grade-III in Public Works Department was attached to the Office of Superintending Engineer, Public Works Department, Circle Durg temporarily vide order dated 11.2.2003 Annexure P-2.

2. The petitioner has filed this petition impugning the said order dated 11.2.2003. This Court vide order dated 8.4.2003 has stayed the operation of the impugned order dated 11.2.2003. The petitioner has continued to work on the same place of posting. At this stage, it is not necessary to go into the validity of the impugned order dated 112.2003. By virtue of the order dated 18.4.2003, the petitioner has already been granted relief and thereby he continued to work.

3. In view of foregoing, the petition stands disposed of and the respondents are at liberty to pass any transfer order to post the petitioner in the Public Interest and

49

on administrative exigency. The petitioner is also granted liberty to impugn the same, if so advised. In the facts of the case, the respondents/authorities are directed not to insist on compliance of the impugned transfer order.

4. For the reasons stated above, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge